

REMARKS

Claims 15 and 17-31 are pending in this application. Claims 15, 18, 21, 27, 28 and 29 have been amended. Care has been exercised to avoid the introduction of new matter. Adequate descriptive support for the present Amendment should be apparent throughout the originally filed disclosure (including page 13, line 10 through page 14, line 4) and claims. Applicants submit that the present Amendment does not generate any new matter issue.

Applicants acknowledge, with appreciation, Examiner Alanko's courtesy and professionalism in conducting a telephonic interview on November 30, 2004, during which the present Amendment was discussed. It is Applicants' understanding that the present Amendment would place this application in condition for allowance.

The disclosure was objected to because of minor informalities. The Examiner asserted that the specification does not clearly link structure and function for the terms "mounting means" and "heating means" in accordance with the sixth paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112. Applicants respectfully traverse the objection for the reasons outlined below.

Claims 15, 17-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner asserted that the phrases "mounting means" and "heating means" invoke the sixth paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112, and that the specification allegedly lacks an explicit link between structure and function and, therefore, the specification does not adequately describe the invention. Applicants respectfully traverse.

During the telephone interview on November 30, 2004, The Examiner agreed that the replacing the term "mounting means" and "heating means" with "mount" and "heater", respectively, would overcome the above objection and rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first

paragraph. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the disclosure and rejection under the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 are respectfully requested.

Claims 15 and 17-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection in view of the foregoing Amendments to the claims. The Examiner agreed during the telephone interview that by replacing the claim term “close to” with “less than” would overcome the rejection of under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Moreover, the Examiner’s attention is directed to the additional amendments to claims 15, 18, 21, 27, 28 and 29. These amendments were made to correct inadvertent grammatical discrepancies and to provide antecedent support for the claim terms. Support for the claim amendments are found in the original disclosure, including page 13, line 10 through page 14, line 4.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112.

It is believed that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Applicants therefore respectfully request an early and favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application. If there are any outstanding issues which might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner’s amendment, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants’ representative at the telephone number shown below.

10/087,846

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Brian K. Seidleck  
Registration No. 51,321

600 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005-3096  
Phone: 202.756.8000 BKS:apr  
Facsimile: 202.756.8087  
**Date: December 22, 2004**

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277  
as our correspondence address.**